



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,051	03/23/2004	Peng Zhou	KNX-19	2694
20808	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER	
BROWN & MICHAELS, PC 400 M & T BANK BUILDING 118 NORTH TIoga ST ITHACA, NY 14850			SINES, BRIAN J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1743		

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

LA

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/807,051	ZHOU ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian J. Sines	1743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "chip-to-chip" in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear as to what feature of the claimed apparatus is meant by the term "chip." Does the applicant intend to mean "module" instead of "chip"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:


A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 9, 11 – 13, 15, 16, 18 – 22 & 26 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Purcell et al. (US 3,548,849) (hereinafter "Purcell"). Regarding claims 1, 3 – 5, 11 – 13, 15, 16, 18 – 22 & 26 – 30, as shown in figure 10, Purcell anticipates a microfluidic apparatus structure comprising: a base structure (208) comprising a plurality of well, reservoir or port structures (215 on element 208); a plurality of modules (e.g., 201 & 202) fluidic connection with one another; and including a cover plate structure (e.g., 207) (see col. 8, lines 15 – 68).

Regarding claim 2, Purcell teaches the incorporation of ports (e.g., 210, 210a, 212), which

provide external fluidic access to the apparatus (see col. 8, lines 31 – 42). Regarding claims 6 & 7, Purcell teaches the incorporation of apertures or ports (212) in the cover plate structure (207). Regarding claim 8, Purcell teaches that the base structure (208) includes aperture or port structures (215). Regarding claim 9, the recitation that the claimed apparatus is “reconfigurable” is considered an intended use limitation. The Courts have held that it is well settled that the recitation of a new intended use, for an old product, does not make a claim to that old product patentable. See *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The Courts have held that apparatus claims must be structurally distinguishable from the prior art in terms of structure, not function. See *In re Danley*, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959); and *Hewlett-Packard Co. V. Bausch and Lomb, Inc.*, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Courts have held that the manner of operating an apparatus does not differentiate an apparatus claim from the prior art, if the prior art apparatus teaches all of the structural limitations of the claim. See *Ex Parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (BPAI 1987) (see MPEP § 2114).



Regarding claim 26, this claim is considered a product-by-process claim in which the determination of patentability is based upon the final end product or apparatus structure itself. The patentability of a product or apparatus does not depend on its method of production or formation. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (see MPEP § 2113).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell in view of Shaw et al. (US 6,290,791) (hereinafter “Shaw”). Purcell does not specifically teach the incorporation of a capillary tube for facilitating fluidic access to the claimed apparatus. Shaw does teach the use of a capillary tube (14) in making an effective fluidic connection with the port or aperture (12) of a microfluidic apparatus (11) (see col. 6, lines 2 – 65; figures 1 & 2). Hence, as evidenced by Shaw, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the suitability, and in addition would have had a reasonable expectation for success, of utilizing a capillary tube for providing a means for introducing a fluid into a microfluidic apparatus. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the use of a capillary tube with the apparatus in order to facilitate effective fluid introduction.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10, 17 & 23 – 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 10, the cited prior art neither teach nor fairly suggest the further incorporation within the Purcell apparatus an optically transparent lid, wherein the lid is positioned to provide optical access to the microfluidic modules.

Regarding claim 17, the cited prior art neither teach nor fairly suggest the further incorporation with the Purcell apparatus the feature that the microfluidic modules are arranged in a diagonal array, such that only one corner of adjacent modules overlap.

Regarding claim 23, the cited prior art neither teach nor fairly suggest the further incorporation within the Purcell apparatus a plurality of deep wells and a plurality of shallow wells.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: The additional cited prior art teach various microfluidic fluid distribution systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Sines, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1263. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (11 AM - 8 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian J. Smith".